

Appln. No. 09/753,352
Amendment dated November 20, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed August 20, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 7 and 9 through 14, and 16 through 32 remain in this application. Claims 8 and 15 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. No claims have been added.

The present Amendment attends to some minor antecedent basis inconsistencies in the claims that are not thought to affect the patentability of the application.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraphs 1 through 14 of the Office Action

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 1 through 8, 14 through 15, 22 through 23 and 25 through 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,234,707 to Maier-Hunke.

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier-Hunke as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,968,171 to Shell.

Claims 8 and 15 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 27, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable over the prior art, and therefore claim 1, as well as claims 2 and 3 which depend from claim 1, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Further, the dependency of the claims 4 through 8, 14, 16, and 19 through 26 have been changed so that they depend from claim 28. As claim

Appln. No. 09/753,352
Amendment dated November 20, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed August 20, 2003

28 was indicated as being allowed over the prior art, claims 4 through 8, 14, 16, and 19 through 26 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 1 through 8, 14, 22 through 23 and 25 through 26 is therefore respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 15 of the Office Action

The indication of allowance of claims 9 through 13, 17 through 18 and 28 through 31 is greatly appreciated. However, it is presumed that claim 32 is also allowable, as claim 32 depends from claim 28 which was allowed

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KAARDAL & LEONARD, LLP

By Jeff Proehl
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35, 987)
KAARDAL & LEONARD, LLP
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5802
(605)336-9446 FAX (605)336-1931
e-mail patent@kaardal.com

Date: NOVEMBER 20, 2003